

A note on the ambipolar diffusion in superfluid neutron stars

E. M. Kantor ^{*}, M. E. Gusakov

Ioffe Physical-Technical Institute of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Polytekhnicheskaya 26, 194021 St.-Petersburg, Russia

Accepted 2017 xxxx. Received 2017 xxxx; in original form 2017 xxxx

ABSTRACT

We address the problem of magnetic field dissipation in the neutron star cores, focusing on the role of neutron superfluidity. We show that in the superfluid matter composed of neutrons, protons, and electrons, magnetic field dissipates exclusively due to Ohmic losses and non-equilibrium beta-processes, while an admixture of muons restores (to some extent) the role of particle relative motion for the field dissipation.

Key words: stars: neutron – stars: interiors – stars: magnetic field

1 INTRODUCTION

Since the pioneering works on the magnetic field dissipation in the neutron star (NS) cores by Baym et al. (1969); Haensel et al. (1990); Goldreich & Reisenegger (1992) a significant progress has been made (e.g., Thompson & Duncan 1996; Hoyos et al. 2008, 2010; Glampedakis et al. 2011; Beloborodov & Li 2016; Passamonti et al. 2017), but many questions have still remained unanswered. One of these questions regards the effects of nucleon superfluidity and superconductivity. How do they affect the magnetic field evolution? In this short note we partly address this question by analyzing the effects of neutron superfluidity. As we believe, this analysis is more accurate (and simple), than the previous treatments (Glampedakis et al. 2011; Passamonti et al. 2017) and it leads us to interesting conclusions. In essence, we argue that the neutron superfluidity drastically modifies the fluid dynamics, imposing an additional (in comparison to the nonsuperfluid matter) constraint on the velocities of different particle species. As a result, ambipolar diffusion becomes completely irrelevant for the magnetic field evolution in the superfluid neutron-proton-electron (*npe*) matter, once the stellar temperature T falls (even slightly) below the neutron critical temperature T_{cn} . Then only Ohmic decay and dissipation due to non-equilibrium beta-processes remain active. An admixture of muons (μ) introduces additional degree of freedom so that dissipation due to particle relative motion can again play a role.

2 MAGNETIC FIELD ENERGY DISSIPATION

2.1 Our assumptions and superfluid equation

We follow the general strategy outlined in Goldreich & Reisenegger (1992). For simplicity, we consider a Newtonian non-rotating NS with the superfluid core composed of *relativistic* finite-temperature *npe* (or *npe μ*) matter, where neutrons are superfluid, and protons are normal (nonsuperconducting). In the absence of magnetic field $\mathbf{B}$ the star is in full thermodynamic and hydrostatic equilibrium, the velocities of all particle species vanish. We assume that the magnetic field is the only mechanism that drives the star out of diffusive and beta-equilibrium. Since the evolution occurs on a very long timescale (Goldreich & Reisenegger 1992), it proceeds through a set of quasistationary states, which means that the time derivatives in the “Euler equations” (Eqs. 4–6 and 20–22, see below), as well as in the continuity equations, can be neglected. Next, the magnetic field is considered as a small perturbation, hence the induced particle velocities are also small and the terms depending on square of these velocities in the dynamic equations can be omitted. For simplicity, we also ignore all surface integrals which could appear in the formulas: It is assumed that they vanish due to the boundary conditions (if this is not the case they can be easily taken into account).

* kantor@mail.ioffe.ru

The magnetic energy dissipates when the system evolves towards equilibrium. The rate of the magnetic energy change,

$$\dot{E}_B = \int_V \frac{\mathbf{B}}{4\pi} \dot{\mathbf{B}} dV, \quad (1)$$

can be presented as (e.g., [Goldreich & Reisenegger 1992](#))

$$\dot{E}_B = - \int_V \mathbf{E} \mathbf{j} dV, \quad (2)$$

where $\mathbf{E}$ is the electric field; $\mathbf{j}$ is the charge current density and V is the system volume.

Because neutrons are assumed to be in the superfluid state, there is an additional degree of freedom in the system – the neutron superfluid velocity $\mathbf{V}_{sn}$, which is related to the wave function phase Φ_n of the neutron Cooper-pair condensate by the condition $\mathbf{V}_{sn} = \nabla \Phi_n / (2m_n)$. Generally, this velocity differs from the velocity of normal neutron component, $\mathbf{u}_n$. In the absence of rotation $\mathbf{V}_{sn}$ obeys the “superfluid” equation (e.g., [Khalatnikov 1989](#); [Gusakov & Andersson 2006](#)),¹

$$m_n \frac{\partial \mathbf{V}_{sn}}{\partial t} + \nabla \mu_n + \frac{\mu_n}{c^2} \nabla \phi = 0, \quad (3)$$

where c is the speed of light; m_n is the neutron bare mass; μ_n is the relativistic neutron chemical potential and ϕ is the gravitational potential. As we have already emphasized, it is justifiable to neglect small inertia term in this (and other) equations. Then it reduces to

$$\nabla \mu_n + \frac{\mu_n}{c^2} \nabla \phi = 0. \quad (4)$$

Note that this equation is valid at arbitrary temperature $T < T_{cn}$ (not only in the zero-temperature limit).

2.2 *npe-matter*

The equations of motion for electrons and nonsuperconducting protons take the form ([Yakovlev & Shalybkov 1990](#))

$$-e(\mathbf{E} + \frac{1}{c} \mathbf{u}_e \times \mathbf{B}) - \nabla \mu_e - \frac{\mu_e}{c^2} \nabla \phi - \frac{J_{ep}}{n_e} (\mathbf{u}_e - \mathbf{u}_p) - \frac{J_{en}}{n_e} (\mathbf{u}_e - \mathbf{u}_n) = 0, \quad (5)$$

$$e(\mathbf{E} + \frac{1}{c} \mathbf{u}_p \times \mathbf{B}) - \nabla \mu_p - \frac{\mu_p}{c^2} \nabla \phi - \frac{J_{ep}}{n_p} (\mathbf{u}_p - \mathbf{u}_e) - \frac{J_{np}}{n_p} (\mathbf{u}_p - \mathbf{u}_n) = 0, \quad (6)$$

where e is the proton electric charge, $\mathbf{u}_e$, $\mathbf{u}_p$, μ_e , and μ_p are the electron and proton velocities and relativistic chemical potentials, respectively. Further, $J_{ik} = J_{ki}$ is the symmetric matrix that describes efficiency of particle collisions (see [Yakovlev & Shalybkov 1990](#)) and n_i is the number density of particle species $i = n, p, e$. In Eqs. (5) and (6) thermo-diffusion terms are neglected.

Equations (4)–(6) should be supplemented by the total force balance equation, which, for the problem in question, takes the standard form (the same for superfluid and nonsuperfluid liquids),

$$\frac{\mathbf{j} \times \mathbf{B}}{c} = \nabla P + \frac{(P + \epsilon)}{c^2} \nabla \phi = \sum_{i=n,p,e} \left(n_i \nabla \mu_i + n_i \frac{\mu_i}{c^2} \nabla \phi \right), \quad (7)$$

where P and ϵ are the pressure and energy density, and $\mathbf{j} = en_p \mathbf{u}_p - en_e \mathbf{u}_e$. Let us now compose the following combination, $[n_e \times (5) + n_p \times (6) - n_n \times (4)] - (7)$. Taking into account the quasineutrality condition, $n_e = n_p$, we get

$$J_{en} (\mathbf{u}_e - \mathbf{u}_n) + J_{np} (\mathbf{u}_p - \mathbf{u}_n) = 0. \quad (8)$$

This equation imposes an additional (in comparison to the non-superfluid matter) constraint on the velocities $\mathbf{u}_i$. For example, if we neglect collisions between neutrons and electrons ($J_{en} = 0$), we obtain $\mathbf{u}_p = \mathbf{u}_n$.

Now, summing up $n_e \times (5) + n_p \times (6) + n_e \times (4)$, we arrive at

$$\frac{\mathbf{j} \times \mathbf{B}}{c} = -n_p \nabla \Delta \mu_e - n_p \frac{\Delta \mu_e}{c^2} \nabla \phi = -e^{-\phi/c^2} n_p \nabla (\Delta \mu_e e^{\phi/c^2}), \quad (9)$$

where $\Delta \mu_e \equiv \mu_n - \mu_p - \mu_e$. In the Newtonian limit $n_p (\Delta \mu_e / c^2) \nabla \phi \ll n_p \nabla \Delta \mu_e$, and we have

$$\frac{\mathbf{j} \times \mathbf{B}}{c} = -n_p \nabla \Delta \mu_e. \quad (10)$$

Note that the Lorentz force $\mathbf{j} \times \mathbf{B} / c$ depends on the gradient of only one scalar function (in contrast to the non-superfluid matter, where it depends on the gradients of two scalar functions, see [Glampedakis & Lasky 2016](#)). This means that only very specific magnetic field configurations can restore hydrostatic equilibrium when neutrons are superfluid ([Glampedakis & Lasky 2016](#)). Thus, once NS temperature drops below the neutron critical temperature T_{cn} at a given point, the magnetic field has to

¹ This equation remains unchanged even if we allow for the diffusion of normal components in the mixture ([Gusakov & Dommes 2017](#), in preparation). Note that the quadratically small velocity-dependent terms in Eq. (3) are already neglected.

rearrange itself to meet the new hydrostatic equilibrium condition (10). This rearrangement may result in magnetar activity and effective dissipation of the magnetic field energy on a typical timescale of NS cooling.²

To find the dissipation rate $\dot{E}_B$ (2), we express $\mathbf{E}$ from Eq. (6) for protons,

$$\mathbf{E} = -\frac{\mathbf{u}_p \times \mathbf{B}}{c} + \frac{\nabla \mu_p}{e} + \frac{\mu_p \nabla \phi}{c^2 e} + \frac{J_{ep}(\mathbf{u}_p - \mathbf{u}_e) + J_{np}(\mathbf{u}_p - \mathbf{u}_n)}{en_p}. \quad (11)$$

The second and third³ terms in Eq. (11) are potential and thus do not contribute to the magnetic field dissipation (to see this, integrate Eq. 2 by parts and use the continuity equation, $\text{div } \mathbf{j} = 0$). Thus,

$$\dot{E}_B = - \int_V \left[-\frac{\mathbf{u}_p \times \mathbf{B}}{c} + \frac{J_{ep}(\mathbf{u}_p - \mathbf{u}_e) + J_{np}(\mathbf{u}_p - \mathbf{u}_n)}{en_p} \right] \mathbf{j} dV. \quad (12)$$

The first term here can be rewritten as

$$\int_V \left(\frac{\mathbf{u}_p \times \mathbf{B}}{c} \right) \mathbf{j} dV = - \int_V \left(\frac{\mathbf{j} \times \mathbf{B}}{c} \right) \mathbf{u}_p dV. \quad (13)$$

Substituting now (10) into (13)

$$- \int_V \left(\frac{\mathbf{j} \times \mathbf{B}}{c} \right) \mathbf{u}_p dV = \int_V (n_p \nabla \Delta \mu_e) \mathbf{u}_p dV, \quad (14)$$

and integrating by parts, one finds (the integral over the distant surface is omitted)

$$\int_V -\text{div}(n_p \mathbf{u}_p) \Delta \mu_e dV. \quad (15)$$

The divergence term here can be expressed with the help of the continuity equation for protons, $\text{div}(n_p \mathbf{u}_p) = \Delta \Gamma$, where the source $\Delta \Gamma$ accounts for the non-equilibrium beta-processes. When $\Delta \mu_e \ll k_B T$, $\Delta \Gamma$ can be approximated as $\Delta \Gamma \approx \lambda_e \Delta \mu_e$ (λ_e is the density and temperature-dependent coefficient and k_B is the Boltzmann constant), so that (15) reduces to

$$\int_V -\lambda_e \Delta \mu_e^2 dV. \quad (16)$$

Returning now to Eq. (12), it can be represented as

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{E}_B = - \int_V \mathbf{E} \mathbf{j} dV = \int_V & [-\lambda_e \Delta \mu_e^2 - J_{en}(\mathbf{u}_e - \mathbf{u}_n)^2 - J_{ep}(\mathbf{u}_e - \mathbf{u}_p)^2 - J_{np}(\mathbf{u}_n - \mathbf{u}_p)^2] dV \\ & + \int_V (\mathbf{u}_e - \mathbf{u}_n) [J_{en}(\mathbf{u}_e - \mathbf{u}_n) + J_{np}(\mathbf{u}_p - \mathbf{u}_n)] dV, \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

or, in view of Eq. (8),

$$\dot{E}_B = - \int_V \mathbf{E} \mathbf{j} dV = \int_V [-\lambda_e \Delta \mu_e^2 - J_{en}(\mathbf{u}_e - \mathbf{u}_n)^2 - J_{ep}(\mathbf{u}_e - \mathbf{u}_p)^2 - J_{np}(\mathbf{u}_n - \mathbf{u}_p)^2] dV. \quad (18)$$

Clearly, magnetic field dissipates due to particle mutual transformations and relative motion (diffusion). In principle, the same expression can also be derived for non-superfluid *npe* matter (Gusakov et al., in preparation), but now the velocities are related by the constraint (8). Using this constraint, Eq. (18) can be rewritten as

$$\dot{E}_B = \int_V \left[-\lambda_e \Delta \mu_e^2 - \frac{j^2}{\sigma_0} \right] dV, \quad (19)$$

where $\sigma_0 = e^2 n_e^2 / (J_{ep} + \frac{J_{en} J_{pn}}{J_{en} + J_{pn}})$ is the electrical conductivity in the absence of a magnetic field. We come to an important conclusion that in superfluid *npe* matter there is no magnetic field dissipation due to ambipolar diffusion: Magnetic field dissipates exclusively due to Ohmic decay and non-equilibrium particle transformations. The former is extremely inefficient in neutron stars⁴, while the latter strongly depends on the rate of non-equilibrium beta-processes in NS matter. A typical dissipation timescale associated with these processes can be estimated as $t_{\text{reactions}} \sim B^2 / (4\pi \lambda_e \delta \mu_e^2) \sim 4\pi n_p^2 / (\lambda_e B^2)$. In the case of modified Urca (mUrca) processes this estimate gives⁵ $t_{\text{reactions}} \gtrsim 3 \times 10^{12} T_8^{-6} B_{14}^{-2}$ yrs, too much to affect the magnetic field evolution. In turn, for the direct Urca (dUrca) process we get $t_{\text{reactions}} \gtrsim 2 \times 10^4 T_8^{-4} B_{14}^{-2}$ yrs, i.e., dUrca can be effective dissipation agent for sufficiently strong magnetic fields.

² As results of Glampedakis & Lasky (2016) indicate, the same conclusion also applies if protons are superconducting.

³ In the Newtonian limit $\mu_p \approx m_p c^2$ and is constant throughout the star.

⁴ A typical timescale is $t_{\text{Ohmic}} = 4\pi L^2 \sigma_0 / c^2 \sim 10^{14} T_8^{-5/3}$ yrs, where L is the lengthscale of the magnetic field variation (we take $L \sim 10^6$ cm) and T_8 is the temperature of the NS core, normalized to 10^8 K (Shternin 2008).

⁵ The coefficient λ_e is estimated using the formulas given in the review by Yakovlev et al. (2001).

2.3 $npe\mu$ -matter

An admixture of muons introduces an additional degree of freedom into the system. The dynamic equations for superfluid $npe\mu$ mixture consist of superfluid (neutron) Eq. (4) together with the three equations on the charged components,

$$-e(\mathbf{E} + \frac{1}{c}\mathbf{u}_e \times \mathbf{B}) - \nabla\mu_e - \frac{\mu_e}{c^2}\nabla\phi - \frac{J_{ep}}{n_e}(\mathbf{u}_e - \mathbf{u}_p) - \frac{J_{en}}{n_e}(\mathbf{u}_e - \mathbf{u}_n) - \frac{J_{e\mu}}{n_e}(\mathbf{u}_e - \mathbf{u}_\mu) = 0, \quad (20)$$

$$-e(\mathbf{E} + \frac{1}{c}\mathbf{u}_\mu \times \mathbf{B}) - \nabla\mu_\mu - \frac{\mu_\mu}{c^2}\nabla\phi - \frac{J_{\mu p}}{n_\mu}(\mathbf{u}_\mu - \mathbf{u}_p) - \frac{J_{\mu n}}{n_\mu}(\mathbf{u}_\mu - \mathbf{u}_n) - \frac{J_{e\mu}}{n_\mu}(\mathbf{u}_\mu - \mathbf{u}_e) = 0, \quad (21)$$

$$e(\mathbf{E} + \frac{1}{c}\mathbf{u}_p \times \mathbf{B}) - \nabla\mu_p - \frac{\mu_p}{c^2}\nabla\phi - \frac{J_{ep}}{n_p}(\mathbf{u}_p - \mathbf{u}_e) - \frac{J_{np}}{n_p}(\mathbf{u}_p - \mathbf{u}_n) - \frac{J_{\mu p}}{n_p}(\mathbf{u}_p - \mathbf{u}_\mu) = 0. \quad (22)$$

In Eqs. (20)–(22) $\mathbf{u}_\mu$ and μ_μ are the muon velocity and relativistic chemical potential, respectively. In analogy with Eq. (10) one can derive the force balance equation for superfluid $npe\mu$ matter,

$$\frac{\mathbf{j} \times \mathbf{B}}{c} = -n_e \nabla\Delta\mu_e - n_\mu \nabla\Delta\mu_\mu, \quad (23)$$

and find that the Lorentz force is determined by the gradients of two scalars, $\nabla\Delta\mu_e$ and $\nabla\Delta\mu_\mu$, where $\Delta\mu_\mu \equiv \mu_n - \mu_p - \mu_\mu$. Therefore, comparing to superfluid npe -matter, there is more freedom to choose possible magnetic field configurations. Proceeding in a similar way as in the case of npe matter, one can show that the magnetic field dissipation rate is given by ⁶

$$\dot{E}_B = \int_V \left[-\lambda_e \Delta\mu_e^2 - \lambda_\mu \Delta\mu_\mu^2 - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,k,i \neq k} J_{ik}(\mathbf{u}_i - \mathbf{u}_k)^2 \right] dV, \quad (24)$$

while the velocities $\mathbf{u}_i$ are related by (compare this result with the constraint 8)

$$J_{\mu n}(\mathbf{u}_\mu - \mathbf{u}_n) + J_{en}(\mathbf{u}_e - \mathbf{u}_n) + J_{np}(\mathbf{u}_p - \mathbf{u}_n) = 0. \quad (25)$$

In Eq. (24) the indices i, k run over n, p, e, μ ; λ_μ has the same meaning as λ_e , but is defined for Urca-reactions involving muons. Generally, as follows from Eqs. (24) and (25), the magnetic field dissipation in $npe\mu$ matter is *not* associated exclusively with the Ohmic decay and non-equilibrium beta-processes. Even if we neglect the lepton interactions with neutrons ($J_{en} = J_{\mu n} = 0$), and find that $\mathbf{u}_p = \mathbf{u}_n$ from Eq. (25) (i.e., normal neutrons move with protons), the relative motion between electrons and muons will still enter the dissipation rate. The effect of such motion on the magnetic field dissipation can be relatively small, especially at large densities (when muons more and more resemble electrons). But this should be checked by direct calculation which is beyond the scope of the present short note. Concluding, the presence of muons (or other, more exotic, particle species) complicates the things and may, in principle, affect the magnetic field evolution in superfluid NSs.

3 CONCLUSIONS

Our conclusions can be summarized as follows:

1. Ambipolar diffusion is irrelevant for the magnetic field dissipation in superfluid npe matter. Magnetic field in this case dissipates only because of Ohmic losses (inefficient mechanism in the neutron star cores) and non-equilibrium Urca processes (can be efficient if the direct Urca process is open).
2. Since only very specific magnetic field configurations can ensure hydrostatic equilibrium in superfluid npe matter (see section 2 and the work by Glampedakis & Lasky 2016), magnetic field should “feel” expansion of the superfluid region upon NS cooling and reorganize itself accordingly on a cooling timescale. This may result in an increased magnetic activity, e.g., in magnetars.
3. An admixture of muons will restore, to some extent, the role of ambipolar diffusion for the magnetic field evolution, although the magnetic energy dissipation rate (see Eq. 24 constrained by Eq. 25) will differ from that in non-superfluid matter. In particular, if we neglect the lepton-neutron collisions, there will be no relative motion between normal neutrons and protons.

REFERENCES

- Baym G., Pethick C., Pines D., 1969, *Nature*, 224, 674
 Beloborodov A. M., Li X., 2016, *ApJ*, 833, 261
 Glampedakis K., Jones D. I., Samuelsson L., 2011, *MNRAS*, 413, 2021
 Glampedakis K., Lasky P. D., 2016, *MNRAS*, 463, 2542
 Goldreich P., Reisenegger A., 1992, *ApJ*, 395, 250
 Gusakov M. E., Andersson N., 2006, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, 372, 1776

⁶ The same expression is also valid for non-superfluid $npe\mu$ matter, but then it is not constrained by Eq. (25).

- Haensel P., Urpin V. A., Yakovlev D. G., 1990, *A&A*, 229, 133
Hoyos J., Reisenegger A., Valdivia J. A., 2008, *A&A*, 487, 789
Hoyos J. H., Reisenegger A., Valdivia J. A., 2010, *MNRAS*, 408, 1730
Khalatnikov I. M., 1989, *An Introduction to the Theory of Superfluidity*. Addison-Wesley, New York
Passamonti A., Akgün T., Pons J. A., Miralles J. A., 2017, *MNRAS*, 465, 3416
Shternin P. S., 2008, *Soviet Journal of Experimental and Theoretical Physics*, 107, 212
Thompson C., Duncan R. C., 1996, *ApJ*, 473, 322
Yakovlev D. G., Kaminker A. D., Gnedin O. Y., Haensel P., 2001, *Phys. Rep.*, 354, 1
Yakovlev D. G., Shalybkov D. A., 1990, *Soviet Astronomy Letters*, 16, 86